

# **Departure Survey Report**

**For Fiscal Year 2006**

**IOWA EXECUTIVE BRANCH**



**State of Iowa  
January 2007**

# INTRODUCTION

---

## Purpose

- This project was initiated by the Department of Personnel, now the Department of Administrative Services (DAS)– Human Resources Enterprise (HRE), to assist executive branch agencies in determining why employees leave their employ or state government as well as provide insight into past employee perceptions of their employer. As the workforce continues to age and at the same time the available workforce declines, employers must have data to manage their turnover effectively.

## Objectives

- The specific objectives for this research are to:
  - Determine the most prevalent reasons employees separate from state employment.
  - Determine if departments are utilizing exit interviews.
  - Determine past employee perceptions about compensation and benefit issues.
  - Determine past employee perceptions about employee autonomy issues.
  - Determine past employee perceptions about co-workers/supervisors.
  - Determine past employee perceptions about diversity issues.
  - Determine past employee perceptions about communication issues.

## Cost of Project

- The costs for this project are based on the following:

	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>Total Project Costs</u>
Postage Costs (sending)	\$570.60	\$642.00	\$3,674.00
Postage Costs (receiving)	\$231.00	\$275.10	\$1,289.65
Mailing Costs (10x13 envelopes)	\$184.68	\$207.79	\$1,247.39
Mailing Costs (9.5x11 envelopes)	\$183.35	\$206.30	\$1,238.36
Human Capital Costs	\$2,859.41	\$3,032.44	\$15,506.57
Survey Development Cost	\$0	\$0	\$3,289.60
<b>Total Cost of Project</b>	<b>\$4,029.05</b>	<b>\$4,363.63</b>	<b>\$26,245.57</b>

## This Report

- The report that follows contains the methodology and key findings for the State of Iowa as an employer after the sixth year of data collection. **ALL TOTAL FIGURES INCLUDE SIX YEARS WORTH OF DATA.**

## METHODOLOGY

---

### Sample

- The population for this year's survey consisted of all those executive branch employees who left state employment or made an interagency transfer over the course of fiscal year 2006. The population surveyed included 1,070 past and current employees comprised of 209 transfers, 281 retirees and early retirees, and 580 voluntary separations.

### Sample Contact

- Packets were mailed throughout FY' 06 after an approximate lag period of 60 days from the date of separation. Each packet included a survey and postage paid return envelope.
- As of September 30, 2006, the designated cut-off date, the total return was as follows:

	<b><u>FY 2005</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2006</u></b>	<b><u>Total Project</u></b>
Number Mailed	951	1,070	6,423
Returned Undeliverable	6	25	110
Net Delivered	945	1,045	6,313
Responses (n)	330	393	2,312
<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>34.9%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>36.6%</b>

### Data Analysis

- The data collected in this study was edited, coded, entered and verified.
- Results have been generated to provide a total for the past 6 fiscal years.
- In addition, appropriate demographics have been provided and cross tabulations have been produced.
- The tabulated data have been thoroughly analyzed based on the purpose and objectives defined at the outset of the project.
- Frequencies have been calculated for all the questions on the survey.

## KEY FINDINGS – DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF TOTAL SAMPLE

---

### *Characteristics*

	<b><u>FY 2005</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2006</u></b>	<b><u>Total Project</u></b>
<b><u>Sub-samples</u></b>			
Transfers	22.4%	23.4%	18.2%
Retirements	32.4%	32.3%	37.6%
Voluntary Separations	45.2%	44.3%	44.2%
<b><u>Gender</u></b>			
Male	36.1%	38.7%	41.2%
Female	63.9%	61.3%	58.8%
<b><u>Disability</u></b>			
Yes	4.8%	5.9%	5.7%
No	95.2%	94.1%	94.3%
<b><u>Age Group</u></b>			
18-29 years	14.0%	11.2%	12.0%
30-39 years	18.8%	18.8%	18.1%
40-49 years	20.7%	19.6%	17.6%
50-59 years	23.4%	25.2%	27.0%
60-69 years	23.1%	23.4%	24.1%
70+ years	0.0%	1.8%	1.1%
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>			
Caucasian	94.8%	94.9%	95.3%
African American	1.8%	1.3%	1.7%
Asian American	0.9%	0.8%	1.1%
Native American	0.6%	1.3%	.6%
Latino	1.8%	1.8%	1.4%
<b><u>Supervisor</u></b>			
Yes	14.6%	13.3%	16.3%
No	85.4%	86.7%	83.7%

## KEY FINDINGS – DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF TOTAL SAMPLE

---

### ***Characteristics***

	<b><u>FY 2005</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2006</u></b>	<b><u>Total Project</u></b>
<b><u>Length of Employment</u></b>			
Less than 1 year	11.2%	12.7%	9.0%
1-5 years	28.9%	22.6%	28.9%
6-10 years	17.9%	17.8%	12.1%
11-15 years	7.9%	7.4%	8.9%
16-25 years	19.1%	17.3%	18.7%
25+ years	14.9%	22.1%	22.3%
<b><u>Location</u></b>			
Capitol Complex	23.4%	22.7%	25.6%
Regional	14.9%	13.8%	14.8%
Polk County	10.1%	6.6%	5.9%
DOT – Ames	2.5%	4.1%	2.4%
Institution	27.8%	29.3%	29.0%
Home Based	4.4%	3.3%	3.1%
Other	16.8%	20.2%	19.1%
<b><u>Past Dept Employer</u></b>			
Human Services	32.1%	33.8%	37.6%
Corrections	11.0%	13.8%	17.7%
Workforce Development	3.4%	3.3%	6.8%
Transportation*	4.3%	9.0%	6.0%
Education	4.9%	4.4%	5.7%
Public Safety	4.6%	2.8%	5.2%
Natural Resources	2.1%	4.1%	4.7%
Public Health	4.6%	3.1%	4.7%
Veteran's Affairs	3.7%	3.3%	4.0%
Administrative Services	1.2%	2.8%	3.2%
Agriculture	2.8%	1.5%	3.1%
Inspections & Appeals	3.7%	2.1%	3.1%
Revenue	1.8%	1.5%	2.6%
Auditor	3.1%	2.1%	1.5%
Public Defense	1.5%	2.1%	1.4%
All Others	15.2%	10.3%	10.5%

\*Data feed from IT was incorrect until 2003.

## KEY FINDINGS – TOTAL SAMPLE PROFILE

---

### Top 5 reasons for Separating from State Employment

<u>Reason</u>	Percent of respondents listing this reason in 2005	Percent of respondents listing this reason in 2006	Total percent of respondents listing this reason*
1. Working Conditions	33.6%	34.9%	30.5%
2. Quality of Supervision	26.4%	25.2%	25.2%
3. Career Advancement Opportunity	23.9%	28.5%	23.7%
4. Organization Culture	17.9%	17.3%	17.2%
5. Co-Worker Relations	17.0%	15.0%	14.2%

\*Respondent could select more than one. Omits those who left because of retirement.

### Length of Job Search

	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>Total Percent</u>
Started search within the last 90 days	41.3%	27.3%	31.3%
Started search within the last 6 months	24.0%	35.6%	28.8%
Started search within the last year	14.8%	18.5%	20.3%
Started search over a year ago	19.8%	18.5%	19.6%

#### **Employing Agency asked employee to reconsider leaving.**

- 29.4% of respondents said that their previous department encouraged them to reconsider leaving in 2005. This number increased in 2006 to 27.4%.

#### **Employing Agency encouraged employee to check other State employee career options.**

- In 2005, 8.9% of respondents said that their previous department encouraged them to explore alternative state career options prior to leaving. This number increased slightly in 2006 to 10.5%.

#### **Employee checked into other options that would have allowed him/her to stay.**

- In 2005, 44.8% of respondents said they, in fact, did check into options that would have allowed them to stay with the State prior to leaving. This number increased in 2006 to 42.1%.

#### **Employing Agency conducted an Exit Interview.**

- 25.4% of respondents said that their previous department conducted an exit interview prior to leaving in 2005, with a decrease to 33.2% in 2006.

### ***Individual Survey Items***

---

I would apply for another position with the State of Iowa if I were looking for work (35).



**Strongly Disagree      -2-      -3-      -4-      -5-      Strongly Agree**

2005	10.4%	4.0%	5.5%	19.9%	24.8%	35.3%
2006	8.6%	5.2%	9.4%	15.1%	23.6%	38.2%
Total	11.6%	6.2%	8.6%	16.0%	23.5%	34.1%

	26.4% disagreed to some degree	73.6% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

### ***Compensation & Rewards***

I was recognized when I did exceptional work (1).

2005	18.1%	14.1%	18.7%	19.9%	15.3%	13.8%
2006	16.9%	16.1%	16.4%	17.4%	20.0%	13.2%
Total	16.6%	16.8%	17.0%	19.4%	17.4%	12.8%

	50.4% disagreed to some degree	49.6% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The benefits I received met my expectations (2).

2005	3.4%	3.4%	10.7%	18.0%	34.8%	29.9%
2006	2.8%	3.9%	8.3%	16.0%	34.9%	34.1%
Total	2.9%	4.4%	9.5%	19.5%	35.6%	28.0%

	16.8% disagreed to some degree	83.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I was paid fairly for the work I did (3).

2005	8.6%	10.7%	10.7%	22.4%	29.8%	17.8%
2006	8.1%	9.4%	12.8%	17.8%	29.5%	22.5%
Total	7.5%	10.5%	13.5%	20.2%	29.1%	19.2%

	31.5% disagreed to some degree	68.5% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My pay was similar to employees performing the same jobs in the private sector (4).

2005	13.9%	17.6%	19.5%	19.8%	18.6%	10.5%
2006	13.6%	12.2%	20.2%	22.6%	19.7%	11.7%
Total	15.1%	16.9%	19.1%	21.3%	16.7%	10.9%

	51.1% disagreed to some degree	48.9% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



**Strongly Disagree      -2-      -3-      -4-      -5-      Strongly Agree**

I was asked to do an appropriate amount of work for the amount I was paid (19).

2005	11.4%	13.6%	14.8%	20.7%	23.1%	16.4%
2006	11.1%	11.1%	9.8%	23.3%	29.3%	15.3%
Total	10.6%	13.0%	12.4%	20.9%	27.0%	16.1%

	36.0% disagreed to some degree	64.0% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

### **Work Tools**

My office environment helped me provide quality products and services (5).

2005	10.2%	17.6%	17.6%	26.6%	18.0%	9.9%
2006	12.1%	19.7%	21.0%	20.7%	18.9%	7.6%
Total	13.7%	16.3%	20.2%	22.6%	18.4%	8.8%

	50.1% disagreed to some degree	49.9% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The training I received permitted me to update and expand my skills (6).

2005	14.6%	13.1%	16.2%	23.2%	22.3%	10.7%
2006	12.6%	14.4%	15.2%	22.9%	24.7%	10.1%
Total	12.8%	14.2%	16.1%	24.0%	22.6%	10.4%

	43.1% disagreed to some degree	56.9% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The technology I was provided was sufficient to accomplish my work (7).

2005	4.6%	6.4%	16.8%	26.3%	32.1%	13.8%
2006	6.5%	8.3%	13.5%	24.9%	31.6%	15.3%
Total	6.0%	8.9%	15.9%	25.0%	30.9%	13.5%

	30.7% disagreed to some degree	69.3% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I was provided the necessary orientation and training to successfully carry out my job duties (9).

2005	9.5%	10.7%	18.0%	23.2%	25.0%	13.7%
2006	10.4%	11.7%	16.4%	21.1%	27.4%	12.8%
Total	9.7%	12.7%	17.5%	22.9%	25.0%	12.2%

	39.9% disagreed to some degree	60.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------





**Strongly Disagree**

**-2-**

**-3-**

**-4-**

**-5-**

**Strongly Agree**

I was given complete and accurate information regarding my job duties prior to accepting the job I recently vacated (17).

2005	7.1%	9.6%	17.3%	20.4%	29.1%	16.4%
2006	10.2%	12.5%	14.6%	23.2%	24.7%	14.8%
Total	9.6%	11.1%	16.0%	23.1%	25.3%	14.8%

	36.8% disagreed to some degree	63.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Policies and procedures were clear and aided me in performing my job (24).

2005	10.7%	11.3%	16.6%	23.0%	24.8%	13.5%
2006	12.1%	11.1%	16.8%	21.4%	26.6%	11.9%
Total	11.4%	11.6%	17.0%	22.6%	24.9%	12.6%

	40.0% disagreed to some degree	60.0% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

### **Communication**

Communication was open and informative within my work unit (13).

2005	19.8%	13.7%	15.5%	19.5%	18.9%	12.5%
2006	22.3%	15.6%	15.1%	15.8%	20.0%	11.2%
Total	20.4%	16.0%	15.6%	16.9%	19.1%	12.0%

	52.0% disagreed to some degree	48.0% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My department's vision, mission, and goals were communicated to me (14).

2005	10.4%	7.7%	15.3%	19.3%	27.3%	19.9%
2006	7.7%	8.0%	16.2%	20.6%	30.4%	17.0%
Total	9.4%	9.2%	16.0%	22.6%	25.6%	17.3%

	34.5% disagreed to some degree	65.5% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I had a clear understanding of how I contributed to the mission of my department (15).

2005	9.1%	11.9%	14.0%	19.2%	28.0%	17.7%
2006	8.5%	10.8%	14.4%	19.0%	31.1%	16.2%
Total	8.6%	11.1%	15.5%	20.7%	27.0%	17.0%

	35.3% disagreed to some degree	64.7% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



**Strongly Disagree      -2-      -3-      -4-      -5-      Strongly Agree**  
 I received timely and effective feedback about my performance (16).

2005	13.8%	18.8%	19.7%	18.5%	19.7%	9.5%
2006	15.5%	14.7%	17.8%	20.9%	18.6%	12.4%
Total	17.2%	17.5%	18.3%	19.2%	17.4%	10.3%

	53.0% disagreed to some degree	47.0% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

### ***Intrinsic Value & Autonomy***

There were career advancement opportunities for me if I had chosen to stay (8).

2005	40.0%	21.2%	14.2%	12.3%	7.7%	4.6%
2006	39.2%	20.9%	17.8%	9.9%	7.6%	4.7%
Total	41.8%	21.9%	14.1%	11.0%	6.9%	4.3%

	77.8% disagreed to some degree	22.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I was required to do was meaningful (18).

2005	3.7%	3.4%	9.5%	16.6%	32.8%	34.0%
2006	2.6%	3.9%	9.0%	19.8%	31.7%	33.0%
Total	3.2%	4.5%	9.5%	18.3%	31.6%	32.9%

	17.2% disagreed to some degree	82.8% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I was required to do was enjoyable (20).

2005	4.6%	9.5%	13.2%	27.3%	27.0%	18.4%
2006	5.4%	10.3%	12.9%	22.2%	26.9%	22.2%
Total	6.0%	8.8%	13.9%	23.6%	27.9%	19.7%

	28.8% disagreed to some degree	71.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I performed was consistent with my career interests (21).

2005	3.1%	9.3%	10.8%	24.5%	29.4%	22.9%
2006	4.4%	7.0%	13.1%	22.5%	30.0%	23.0%
Total	5.3%	7.5%	13.3%	21.6%	30.9%	21.4%

	26.2% disagreed to some degree	73.8% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



**Strongly Disagree**

**-2-**

**-3-**

**-4-**

**-5-**

**Strongly Agree**

My job gave me opportunities to serve the citizens of Iowa and “make a difference” (29).

2005	4.9%	2.8%	7.1%	19.7%	29.5%	36.0%
2006	3.6%	3.9%	10.1%	19.6%	26.0%	36.9%
Total	4.8%	5.2%	9.7%	18.6%	28.6%	33.2%

	19.6% disagreed to some degree	80.4% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My job met my personal expectations and was in line with my personal goals (30).

2005	4.3%	12.3%	15.0%	26.1%	25.5%	16.9%
2006	6.2%	9.8%	15.2%	24.0%	25.0%	19.8%
Total	7.4%	10.4%	15.5%	22.2%	27.6%	16.9%

	33.3% disagreed to some degree	66.7% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I performed was consistent with my skill level (32).

2005	8.3%	7.4%	6.8%	19.8%	34.6%	23.1%
2006	7.0%	4.2%	10.9%	15.1%	36.4%	26.5%
Total	7.5%	7.5%	9.6%	16.6%	34.5%	24.2%

	24.7% disagreed to some degree	75.3% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I was encouraged to develop to my maximum potential (33).

2005	14.6%	11.8%	15.8%	22.9%	18.9%	16.1%
2006	14.2%	10.9%	16.3%	16.5%	25.3%	16.8%
Total	14.8%	12.2%	15.6%	19.4%	21.9%	16.1%

	42.6% disagreed to some degree	57.4% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

### **Organizational Culture**

I was never harassed or treated poorly at work (10).

2005	18.1%	14.7%	13.2%	11.3%	20.6%	22.1%
2006	22.8%	12.2%	12.4%	10.6%	19.9%	22.0%
Total	20.6%	11.5%	12.2%	13.0%	20.4%	22.4%

	44.3% disagreed to some degree	55.7% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



**Strongly Disagree**

**-2-**

**-3-**

**-4-**

**-5-**

**Strongly Agree**

All employees in my department were treated fairly (11).

2005	23.9%	19.0%	15.0%	14.1%	15.3%	12.8%
2006	23.7%	18.8%	17.2%	15.2%	16.2%	9.0%
Total	24.6%	17.9%	15.1%	15.7%	15.1%	11.6%

	57.6% disagreed to some degree	42.4% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My department was accepting of diverse individuals and groups (12).

2005	7.7%	11.0%	12.0%	20.2%	27.6%	21.5%
2006	10.7%	10.9%	13.8%	18.2%	28.6%	17.7%
Total	10.2%	8.5%	13.6%	19.9%	28.5%	19.3%

	32.3% disagreed to some degree	67.7% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Teamwork and cooperation were encouraged in my work unit (27).

2005	12.3%	11.4%	11.7%	17.8%	27.4%	19.4%
2006	11.4%	11.4%	9.8%	18.9%	26.7%	21.8%
Total	12.3%	10.3%	10.9%	17.1%	26.8%	22.7%

	33.5% disagreed to some degree	66.5% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Employee complaints and problems were appropriately handled in a timely manner (28).

2005	25.4%	15.8%	13.9%	18.9%	15.5%	10.5%
2006	24.2%	16.8%	15.5%	18.3%	16.0%	9.3%
Total	24.7%	15.5%	15.3%	19.0%	16.7%	8.8%

	55.5% disagreed to some degree	44.5% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Taking initiative was encouraged in my work unit (31).

2005	11.1%	10.5%	13.5%	18.2%	27.1%	19.7%
2006	11.5%	10.9%	12.8%	16.7%	27.3%	20.8%
Total	12.1%	10.9%	11.9%	17.9%	26.3%	21.0%

	34.9% disagreed to some degree	65.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



Strongly Disagree

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

Strongly Agree

### ***Supervisor Perceptions***

I had a good working relationship with my immediate supervisor (22).

2005	14.1%	11.7%	10.1%	14.1%	21.2%	28.8%
2006	14.5%	7.8%	8.8%	13.0%	23.6%	32.4%
Total	13.8%	8.5%	9.7%	13.7%	23.7%	30.6%

	32.0% disagreed to some degree	68.0% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The supervision provided to me was effective (23).

2005	19.9%	11.7%	10.1%	17.8%	21.2%	19.3%
2006	19.2%	10.6%	11.9%	16.4%	20.5%	21.3%
Total	19.0%	11.5%	12.3%	15.4%	23.0%	18.9%

	42.8% disagreed to some degree	57.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My supervisor let me know that he/she valued my contributions (25).

2005	19.1%	8.9%	12.9%	16.9%	19.4%	22.8%
2006	17.9%	12.7%	9.8%	13.0%	22.8%	23.8%
Total	18.0%	11.9%	10.6%	14.3%	22.2%	23.0%

	40.5% disagreed to some degree	59.5% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

### ***Co-worker Perceptions***

I had a good working relationship with my co-workers (26).

2005	4.0%	3.4%	6.8%	16.0%	35.7%	34.2%
2006	3.6%	5.4%	5.2%	15.2%	32.7%	37.9%
Total	3.8%	3.9%	6.2%	14.4%	35.1%	36.6%

	13.9% disagreed to some degree	86.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The State employees I knew were hard-working and took pride in the work they did (34).

2005	8.6%	8.3%	13.2%	22.5%	26.5%	20.9%
2006	7.5%	8.8%	13.5%	21.2%	28.8%	20.2%
Total	7.0%	8.9%	13.9%	21.4%	28.5%	20.3%

	29.8% disagreed to some degree	70.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

## **Preference Ratings**

---

### **Top 5 things past employees liked about their employment with the State**

<b><u>Liked Most</u></b>	<b>Percent of respondents in 2005</b>	<b>Percent of respondents in 2006</b>	<b>Total percent of respondents *</b>
1. Made Multiple Choices*	40.4%	46.2%	40.0%
2. Benefits	19.8%	15.6%	16.6%
3. Co-Worker Relations	11.4%	13.0%	12.5%
4. Retirement Benefits	7.4%	8.6%	9.6%
5. Rate of Pay	7.4%	6.2%	7.7%

\*Respondent was only supposed to select one.

### **Top 5 things attracting past employees to their current jobs**

<b><u>Attracting Feature</u></b>	<b>Percent of respondents in 2005</b>	<b>Percent of respondents in 2006</b>	<b>Total percent of respondents *</b>
1. Career Advancement Opportunity	24.2%	30.4%	25.6%
2. Working Conditions	29.4%	25.8%	24.3%
3. Rate of Pay	23.9%	21.2%	18.9%
4. Organizational Culture	14.5%	15.1%	13.7%
5. Opportunity for Training	13.9%	11.5%	11.9%

\*Respondent could select more than one.

### **Top 5 things past employees liked least about their employment with the State**

<b><u>Liked Least</u></b>	<b>Percent of respondents in 2005</b>	<b>Percent of respondents in 2006</b>	<b>Total percent of respondents *</b>
1. Made Multiple Choices*	30.7%	42.0%	33.5%
2. Quality of Supervision	14.6%	11.1%	13.1%
3. Career Advancement Opportunity	15.8%	11.9%	12.8%
4. Organizational Culture	9.3%	10.5%	11.6%
5. Working Conditions	10.8%	9.2%	10.6%

\*Respondent was only supposed to select one.

## Revisit of Objectives

---

### *Determine the most prevalent reasons employees separate from state employment.*

Based on the 6-year aggregate sample, respondents list the top reason for leaving to be, “Working Conditions” followed closely by “Quality of Supervision” and “Career Advancement Opportunity”. These three reasons were also three of the top five things listed as aspects of state employment least liked by respondents. Further, perceptions of “Career Advancement Opportunity” and “Working Conditions” provided by other employers were the top two attracting features to the respondents.

### *Determine if departments are utilizing exit interviews.*

Unfortunately, only a little over 30.5% of respondents stated that their previous state employer conducted an exit interview, based on the 6-year aggregate sample. There has been an overall decrease since this survey was implemented in 2001. In 2001, 34.4% of respondents stated in the affirmative their previous State employer performed this important step. In 2006, this number has dropped slightly to 33.2%. This is a window from which a department can ascertain and provide feedback about their particular operation.

### *Determine past employee perceptions about compensation and benefit issues.*

Based on the 6-year aggregate sample, respondents perceived their benefits in a very positive light. Over 83% of respondents felt the benefits offered met their expectations (2), and it was the single most often cited aspect of working for the State that respondents liked. On the other hand, just under half of the respondents felt they earned less than people working the same jobs in the private sector. Interestingly, “Rate of Pay” was not a major reason listed for leaving but it was the third highest attracting feature perceived to be offered by other employers. Most employees felt they were paid fairly (3) and asked to do an appropriate amount of work for what they were paid (19).

***Determine past employee perceptions about employee autonomy and intrinsic value.***

Although most respondents believe the work they performed as a state employee was meaningful (18), enjoyable (20), consistent with their career interests (21) and perceived skill levels (32), and allowed them to serve Iowa citizens and “make a difference” (29), just over half of these same respondents did not feel they could develop to their full potential (33) nor did they believe that there were career opportunities if they had chosen to stay (8), over 77% answered negatively on item 8. This last perception is especially dangerous to the State due to the fact that perceived career advancement opportunities appear to be a major reason for leaving and a major attracting feature of other employers.

***Determine past employee perceptions about co-workers/supervisors.***

Respondents as a group did not provide overly negative responses to any of the questions regarding supervision (22, 23, and 25). However, it was cited as the fourth highest reason for leaving and one of the top five factors cited as “liked least” about employment with the State.

***Determine past employee perceptions about co-workers/supervisors.***

The two items dealing with co-worker perceptions (26 & 34) were two of the most positive items responded to on the survey and perceptions about co-workers/supervisors was listed as one of the top 5 things liked most about state employment.

***Determine past employee perceptions about diversity issues.***

In the future, as more data is collected comparisons will be possible between ethnic groups on all items and especially those items falling under the heading of Organizational Culture in this report. Unfortunately, all that can be said on this topic now is that two-thirds of respondents felt their past department was accepting of diverse individuals (12). A majority of the respondents, however, did not feel that all employees in their past department were treated fairly (11). Unfortunately, because the numbers do not allow it, race cannot be tested as a factor in this perception.

***Determine past employee perceptions about communication issues.***

Over half of the respondents disagreed that communication was open and informative within their past work unit (13) and that feedback was timely and effective regarding performance (16).



## Conclusion

---

Based on the 6-year aggregate sample, it appears that out of the 35 individual items on the survey, only 14 items could be said to have received very positive responses (over 2/3rds agreement with an item). This is not too surprising as this is an exit survey and respondents are likely to be somewhat more negative/honest in their responses. Regardless, there are many positives to be found. Only eight items have over 50% of the respondents disagreeing with a specific item, so in most cases the majority of respondents are answering positively to the questions. More importantly almost 74% of the respondents agreed to some degree that they would likely apply for another position with the State if they were looking.

After reviewing this report the reader should realize that all the objectives for this project have been met to some degree. The nature of this type of survey is dependent on the population of interest and as such the usefulness will grow over time as more data becomes available. At some later date, differences between specific departments and groups will be made. The response rate is promising and over time the different subgroups will reach a level where group comparison and more significance testing will be possible.